

Wednesday, December 11, 1844.

Christmas Presents.

A friend, whose opinions we highly esteem, says that he intends to make Christmas presents to his friends of two or three copies of our paper. The advantage of this will be, that they will be receiving a present every week for one year. He thinks, of course, that a present of this sort would be more valuable than an annual.

At his suggestion, also, for we were too modest to think of such a thing ourselves, we invite every well-wisher of the Philanthropist to do likewise. And by the way, we are not very particular. If any one has any scraps about harking our paper a Christmas present, he may make a new year's present of it. It would be the same to us, and only a dollar to him. Think of it, friends.

When an Editor is in Good Spirits.

An editor is in good spirits, and can write well, when new subscribers are coming in every day, and old ones are remembering that the laborer is worthy of his hire.

Remember that also.

The October and November numbers of Facts for the People, will be sent out together next week. We shall then hasten the December number, so that we may begin the next volume with the year, if possible.

Session Subscribers.

There is yet room for session subscribers—25 cents a piece.

Terms of our Weekly Paper.

One Dollar a year, always payable in advance.

Popular Vote in 1840 and 1844—Remarkable Facts.

We give below the popular vote of 1840 in full, and that of 1844 so far as ascertained—A few remarkable facts may here be noticed in connection with these tables.

Since the year 1840, judging from the ratio of increase in the ten years then ending, there has been an increase in the population of Maine, New-Hampshire and Vermont, of about 57,000. And yet, by referring to these tables, it will be seen that there is a falling off in the popular vote of these States since 1840, of 20,101! Taking one in four as the proportion of voters to the population, there ought to have been an increase of 14,250. The inference is that 34,353 voters stood at home.

In Maine and New-Hampshire, two Democratic States, the decrease is most remarkable—10,181 in the former, 8,105 in the latter, 10,018!

Who can assign a reason for this political phenomenon?

In Massachusetts, there is an increase, but a small one, being only 4,635—about one-fourth of the actual increase of her voters. In Rhode Island there is an increase, owing to the extension of the right of suffrage. Connecticut shows a gain of 7,545; equal to her increase of actual voters. In that State, the Tariff question had great power, and the Liberty movement but little. In Massachusetts, Vermont, New-Hampshire and Maine, the Liberty men are strong in proportion to the population, and the anti-slavery feeling is deep—and in the last two States, less importance is attached to the Tariff. Now, in those States, including the twelve thousand increase not exhibited in the vote of Massachusetts, some 46,000 voters must have abstained themselves from the polls.

In New-York and Ohio, States in which the anti-slavery sentiment is strong, the popular vote has not increased in proportion to the increase of population; but in New-Jersey, Indiana and Pennsylvania, in which the Liberty party has made little headway, the voters and population have increased in about the same ratio.

In Michigan, another State pervaded by anti-slavery sentiment, the increase of population from 1830 to 1840 was 571 per cent. Taking 250 as the rate per cent. from 1840 to 1850, the increase of voters since 1840 ought to have been over 50,000, whereas it is only about 11,000! While in Missouri, whose increase during the ten years ending 1840, was at the rate of 170 per cent., and whose increase for the decade closing with 1850 may be set down at 100 per cent., the increase of the popular vote since 1840 has been 30,000, equal most probably to its actual increase of voters!

Does the reader begin to see light shining upon these remarkable phenomena? In a word, can he for a moment doubt that in Mr. Polk's slavery and annexation-committalism, on one hand, and Mr. Clay's slavery and blameworthy moral character, on the other, are to be found the principal reason, why forty-six thousand voters in the New-England States refused to exercise their right of suffrage, and so many voters in Ohio, Michigan and New-York, remained at home, scorning to choose between candidates forced upon the free North by a slaveholding oligarchy? But, how much better would it have been, had these dissentients made themselves manifest by voting with the Liberty party! Their protest would then have been heard, their testimony would have been visible.

And here, another question of some moment arises: how happens it that this large number of men, disgusted, as we have now good reason to believe, with the pro-slavery servility of the Whig and Democratic parties, could not be induced to vote the Liberty ticket? We commend this inquiry to our brethren of the Liberty press.

Look now at the vote of the Slave States—So far as reported, there is a decided increase since 1840, in every State, in about the same ratio as that of population. What is the explanation? Both candidates were slaveholders, and therefore commanded the entire vote of the States in which this system prevailed.

On the whole, then, we have a right to infer, that the indirect, imperceptible efforts of the anti-slavery agitation at the North, are even greater than its direct, manifest results. It has made many Liberty voters, but more non-voters on anti-slavery grounds. This process is continually going on. Is it wise in politicians to disregard it? How long are all these anti-slavery non-voters will become Liberty voters? Can the reader now see what materials we have, already prepared, to give power to our next demonstration?

Another circumstance worthy of notice, is the vast disparity between the increase of the popular vote from 1836 to 1840, and that from 1840 to 1844. Taking the free States below from which we have returns, the difference is thus shown:

Increase from 1836 to 1840, 572,253
Increase from 1840 to 1844, 169,510
In the slave States, from which returns are received, the difference is thus shown:
Increase from 1836 to 1840, 295,196
Increase from 1840 to 1844, 295,653

In other words, while in all these States, from 1836 to 1840, the popular vote increased 777,449, the increase in the same States from 1840 to 1844, has been only 252,163! The gain in '44, with the remarkable exceptions we have indicated above, bears a pretty fair proportion to the increase of population in the last four years. The enormous augmentation of the popular vote in the preceding four years, must have been owing to the fact, that up to 1840, a very large proportion of the American People took little or no interest in political affairs.

We submit the tables, and shall file them up, as the official returns may be reported. The Liberty vote, including that of Illinois not reported, will be about sixty-three thousand, several thousand less than at the gubernatorial and State elections.

But, let the reduction to two cents for all distances be made at once, and then we shall have the experiment fairly tried. The benefits of the mail would thus be equalized. None so poor that he cannot raise two cents. All who could, would write. Correspondence would be more universal and constant. Private mails, contraband conveyance of mailable matter, would be utterly put down; so that the multiplication of postage paying letters would be incalculable, the deficit in revenue consequently be less, than under any mode of partial reform that could be devised.

We once were opposed to this reduction. The reason was: our Government was in debt, and running in debt; the revenue was insufficient for ordinary expenditures; so that it was not a time to try an experiment, which we knew must throw an additional burden upon a Treasury already exhausted. But, that time has gone by. We are fast paying off the National debt. Soon there will be a large surplus in the Treasury. A better time for trying this experiment of a great reform can never again be.

But, let us be prepared for a falling off in the revenues of the Department, as a consequence of reduction. With some it is a favorite notion that the increase of correspondence would be so great, as to keep up the revenue to its present standard. But it is only a notion. The experiment of England is no certain guide for us, so different are the two countries circumstanced. More to-morrow.

Cheap Postage—The Demand of the People.

One of the greatest wants of the American people is, Cheap Postage.

England has no new lands within her island territory, to stimulate emigration. Families there for the most part are nearly stationary, unless their different members go abroad. The son or daughter may travel a few miles from the old homestead, but not so far that frequent visits may not supply the lack of correspondence. In this way, home-feelings, and home-virtues are perpetuated, and the influences of the family extended.

Our country is differently circumstanced. We have a boundary line stretching thousands of miles. The rich and illimitable fields of the West, invite emigration, loosen family ties, counteract the influences of home, and thus stamp upon our population a roving character. The grey-haired father in Maine has but one son struggling in the swamps of Florida, another encountering the perils of border life on a Texas boundary, and a daughter rearing a pioneer offspring in the Far West. Few parents have the pleasure of seeing their children grow up around them. There is a continued breaking up of families, the various members of which frequently part to see each other no more.

Now, could they but maintain a constant correspondence with each other, the family, with all its holy influences, might in one sense, be preserved whole. What enduring life would be given to affection! How much enjoyment might be realized! How old and restraining associations would be perpetuated! How many wanderers would be fortified against the temptations peculiar to border life, and retained in virtuous courses by the oft-recurring precepts, the oft-awakened recollections of home!

But, the question is, out of the question under our present system of postage. The adventure in procuring a heavy tax to correspond with his distant kindred. They too may be poor. Occasionally a letter is exchanged, but long intervals of silence breed indifference, and the wanderer is too often estranged from those whom he should never forget.

Who now can even imagine the wonderful consequences that would follow the adoption of a system of cheap postage? Commerce would spring up in places where the spirit of enterprise now slumbers. The influences of the family institution, so necessary to National Progress, would be extended. Society would become more coherent and homogeneous. The daughter in exile would rejoice, and the heart of the widow bereaved of the presence of her first-born, would leap for joy. The Post Office then would be one of the most powerful conservative influences of the nation.

The peculiar circumstances, therefore, of the American people, with their families broken up, and scattered over a vast extent of territory, never, perhaps, again to be reunited, render cheap postage a peculiar want. No civilized nation requires it so much.

But, the question is, shall we have a radical, or partial reform? Shall we go for such a reduction as shall make the mail accessible to all, or for such, as shall only enlarge the number of the few who now use it? In other words, shall it be made at once a great convenience for the whole People?

Undoubtedly, the Department ought to be adjusted in express reference to the wants of all the People. In that case, we should like to know why the National Treasury ought not to be bound to make up any resulting deficiency? Why, in that case, should the Post Office Department, more than any other, be required to support itself? This is the old policy, adopted in other times from motives of economy, and evidently proceeds on the assumption that the mail is of importance to but a portion of the People. But, why not require the Army and Navy to support themselves? Will any man say that the Post Office is not as great a public benefit as either of these? It is now a benefit to comparatively few, and therefore, so runs the logic, these few ought to support it. But, it is not what it ought to be. Every body in the nation requires mail facilities, and arrangements should be made, so that all may be benefited. There should all, by the small tax paid upon letters, be unable to sustain it entirely, who shall say that it ought not, in addition, be sustained by the common treasury of the Nation? Suppose the deficit should be one, two, or three millions of dollars, what of that? Does not the Navy cost nine millions?

Besides, there is a radical reform adopted, this deficiency would be diminished every year, with the increase of population and commerce, consequently of letter-writers, and also with the improvement in modes of conveyance, and the increasing competition between them: until finally, the Department, as is now the case in England, would more than support itself.

The reduction proposed by some, which contemplates rates of five and ten cents, according to the distance, will not meet the wants of the people. Ten cents is quite a considerable sum for the poor people of civilization to be called upon frequently to pay. He is rich in nerve and muscle, but poor in silver. He could raise two cents, but would reluctantly at ten. This rate would multiply to but a small extent paying letters, and yet would be a considerable reduction on each letter. Nor do we think it

would be conclusive against private mails, or the private transmission of letters. The final result, we fear, would be injurious. The deficit in the Department would be larger than is now anticipated; the public would be disappointed; and many might be led to the conclusion that reform in our country was impracticable, and a return to the old rates necessary.

But, let the reduction to two cents for all distances be made at once, and then we shall have the experiment fairly tried. The benefits of the mail would thus be equalized. None so poor that he cannot raise two cents. All who could, would write. Correspondence would be more universal and constant. Private mails, contraband conveyance of mailable matter, would be utterly put down; so that the multiplication of postage paying letters would be incalculable, the deficit in revenue consequently be less, than under any mode of partial reform that could be devised.

We once were opposed to this reduction. The reason was: our Government was in debt, and running in debt; the revenue was insufficient for ordinary expenditures; so that it was not a time to try an experiment, which we knew must throw an additional burden upon a Treasury already exhausted. But, that time has gone by. We are fast paying off the National debt. Soon there will be a large surplus in the Treasury. A better time for trying this experiment of a great reform can never again be.

But, let us be prepared for a falling off in the revenues of the Department, as a consequence of reduction. With some it is a favorite notion that the increase of correspondence would be so great, as to keep up the revenue to its present standard. But it is only a notion. The experiment of England is no certain guide for us, so different are the two countries circumstanced. More to-morrow.

OHIO LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.

Wednesday, Dec. 4, 1844.

Afternoon Session.

The Speaker announced Messrs. Perkins, Waters and Koch, as the committee on Unfinished Business.

Mr. Eckley moved to take up the rules reported by the committee for the government of the Senate; which was agreed to.

Mr. Miller offered an amendment, providing for the appointment of a committee on the National Road.

The rules were then adopted—yeas 26, nays 3.

The Speaker then announced the following as the standing committees of the Senate:

On Privileges and Elections—Messrs. Gregory, Aten and Coddling.

On the Judiciary—Messrs. Perkins, Bartley and Powell.

On Finance—Messrs. Cox, Disney and Kelley.

On Claims—Messrs. Kelley of Cuyahoga, Warner and Gregory.

On Banks and the Currency—Messrs. Van Vorhes, Chaney and Anderson.

On Roads and Highways—Messrs. Waters, Crouse and Gabriel.

On Schools and School Lands—Messrs. Chaney, Perkins and Quinby.

On New Counties—Messrs. O'Neal, Baldwin and Groff.

On Military Affairs—Messrs. London, Groff and Koch.

On Military Colleges and Societies—Messrs. O'Farrell, King and Kelley of Cuyahoga.

On Colleges and Universities—Messrs. O'Neal, Jones and O'Farrell.

On Agriculture, Commerce and Manufactures—Messrs. Wetmore, Johnson and Gabriel.

On Penitentiaries—Messrs. Coddling, Wood and Gregory.

On Library—Messrs. Powell, King and O'Neal.

On Currency—Messrs. Kelley of Franklin, Hill and Cox.

On Public Lands—Messrs. O'Neal, Waters and Van Vorhes.

On Railroads and Turnpikes—Messrs. Jones, Hastings and Barrett.

On Public Institutions—Messrs. Disney, Wetmore and Eckley.

On Corporations—Messrs. Eckley, Aten and Coddling.

On Public Buildings—Messrs. Barrere, Waters and Groff.

On the Union—Messrs. Kelley of Franklin, Disney and Kelley of Cuyahoga.

On National Road—Messrs. Anderson, Armstrong and Hastings.

Thomas Morris.

The sudden death of Thomas Morris will be severely felt by a large circle of relations, and deeply regretted by numerous friends. He was somewhat past sixty, in vigorous health, and did fair to reach a good old age.

He was a veteran in the political world. For a long time, a leading Democrat in this State, he formerly represented a respectable constituency in the Legislature, and subsequently, the State in the Senate of the United States. Still later, his thorough and consistent devotion to Anti-Slavery principles, in the love of which he had grown up from boyhood, and which he ever most tenaciously cherished, rendered him obnoxious to the Democratic party, and dissolved his connection with it. During the last years of his life, he was associated with the Liberty party, and in the recent canvass, was its candidate for the Vice Presidency.

Mr. Morris had not the advantages of an early education. His school was the world, and he was his own school-master. He was a man of strong prejudices, intense feelings, and robust intellect. Early education and a well-disciplined judgment would have made him one of the most gifted, as he was, one of the most energetic and independent of our politicians. His political integrity has never been questioned; his political consistency, fearlessness and firmness have always been admired even by his enemies. He was not a popular man, for he was not given to popular arts. We have known him intimately for the last six years, and we can declare that if ever there was a politician free from the disposition, and we may add, the ability to play the demagogue, that man was Thomas Morris. He was bold even to temerity, in the conception and expression of his views, and never, as we thought, sufficiently consulted the *quæritur in modo*.

Our friend has gone. He is called suddenly to his final account. The Cause of Human Rights to which he had consecrated his latter days, has lost one of its most fearless champions. Let his memory be honored. Let the "Democracy" which disowned him, be ashamed and hang its head; let the Friends of Freedom weep over his grave. For when in coming time it shall be asked, whose was the only voice that was raised in indignant rebuke of the most eloquent of Senators, when he lifted his hand to crush the cause of Freedom and its advocates, the answer shall be—the voice of the intrepid THOMAS MORRIS.

Again, he quotes another case, in which two men were stripped to the skin, well armed, armed, each with a brace of pistols and bowie knife, and then turned into a room perfectly dark, to fight out their quarrel. A horrid description follows of the combat. Before quoting the case, the reviewer remarks that even in America, this duel must have been regarded as something extraordinary. But, in the course of the description, he warms up with the subject, and at the close, exclaims: "Such horrid examples of unmitigated ferocity ought not to be quoted against the morality or social civilization of any country, unless, in the case of these States, they are not exceptional, but ordinary illustrations of the habits of the people!"

Now it is not worth while to attempt to set such a man to his right. He is deliberately, malignantly, with full purpose, bent on blackening the name of our country, and of all English writers. An Englishman is so insular in his prejudices, that he is the last of men to form a correct judgment of the character and institutions of other people. And an American is the last man an Englishman should write about. For a nation speaking a different language, distinguished by different customs from his own, he may make some allowances. He will at least see the absurdity of attempting to try it by any other than a universal standard. But, in the case of America he can make no such allowance. We speak the same language, are marked by the same general habits of thought and action, and in fundamental points, approach England in the character of our laws and political institutions. So that he forgets our peculiar circumstances, our recent origin, the unsettled condition of our population, and applies to us at once the English standard of life and manners.

Even enlightened Englishmen themselves will at times confess their unfitness to write of other nations. In the same number of the Quarterly in which appears this vituperative notice of our country, another reviewer takes William Howitt to task for his narrow criticism on German civilization. The following remarks are to the point:

"Of all book-writing people, the English are the last to produce works upon the domestic life of other nations, in the right, unbiased, universal spirit. It is not that they do not possess in a very high degree, the requisite qualifications, knowledge, keen observation, sagacity; but that they are afflicted with serious disqualifications which do not exist elsewhere, or, at least, to the same extent. Every thing that does not accord with their own modes and notions, a constant recurrence to the one rigid self-selected judgment. The English cannot enter into the circumstances of other races. Every thing that is new to them jars against their habits. Pleasure itself offends them when it is not cooked to their palate. Even the unalterable elements to which as much of the fabrications of human institutions is unavoidably adopted will sometimes excite a bilious derangement in the English. They will make little or no allowance for the inevitable effects of climate."

Why will not the gentlemen of the Quarterly, of "scrupulous and offended tastes," recall to mind these considerations when writing of America? Why must every thing, no matter how extravagant, which a wandering, strabismic tourist may choose to say of us and our institutions, be taken as sacred truth, while the reports of German life and manners, even by so benevolent and philosophical a man as William Howitt, are questioned severely, and received with great qualifications?

On the whole, we cannot but think, that Literary Men and Reviewers would do more service to the Cause of Humanity and Peace, if they loved truth better than fine writing—and if they would always bear in mind a saying of more than temporal interest—"The liar shall have his portion in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone."

The Supreme Court of the United States commenced its session in Washington, last Monday.

Neither House of Congress will sit to-day, both having adjourned over to Monday, to give time to the Members generally to settle down in their lodgings, and the President Officially to appoint the Standing Committee.

National Intelligence, 6th inst.

It is not too much to say that the Literary Men and Reviewers of Great Britain and France, are the principal causes of the bitter hatred and jealousy with which in many cases the Englishman and Frenchman regard each other. Could they have their way, they would keep both nations wallowing in blood. Literary men should be ministers of peace, but too often they are the ministers of war. A writer in the last Foreign Quarterly, reviewing French aggression in the Pacific, characterizes the French people, as "the most corrupt, cruel and rapacious nation in Europe." And again, speaking of M. Bunt, an agent of France in Tahiti, he says: "This is the gallant man, whom the French Government, urged on by a people, as blood thirsty now as in 1793, a people whose character never has changed since the massacre of St. Bartholomew, reckless of slaughter, incapable of comprehending the idea of justice, and which has chosen to identify itself all over the world with blasphemy and infidelity—this is the man," &c.

It is by such exaggerated denunciations, that nations are inflamed against each other, and negotiations for the peaceful settlement of difficulties, embarrassed.

But, to return to the reviewer of Featherston, who rivals even this latter of the French, in "the scrupulous and offended tastes of gentlemen." The refinement of his taste is only surpassed by the accuracy of his knowledge. He goes with Mr. Featherston to Arkansas, where "murder is cultivated as a pastime," and that describes Little Rock.

"Little Rock is the principal town of Arkansas, a territory lying on the confines between Texas and America, which not being yet sufficiently populated to be admitted to the dignity of a federal state, remains under the immediate protection of the General Government, as a quasi colony."

A man thus grossly ignorant of even the outside of our society, is well fitted to invite the readers of the far-famed Foreign Quarterly, in the mysteries of our inner life. A school boy in this country that should betray a similar degree of ignorance of the internal arrangements of Great Britain, would be laughed at.

But let us see with what "scrupulous and offended tastes" these gentlemen of the Quarterly write on what they know nothing about.

In consequence of this peculiar condition of independence, Arkansas has become a sort of Alsatia for all kinds of thieves and gamblers, forgers, horse-stealers, and the like, who, flying from the inconvenient inquiry of the laws of their hands and daring each other to strike, but cherishing the secret hope that the spectators would interfere."

A finer specimen of gentlemanly indignation and truthfulness, can hardly be found even in the columns of the Quarterly.

The reviewer then quotes the following account from Featherston, as illustrative of ordinary life in Arkansas. The scene is in Little Rock.

"A common practice with these fellows, was to fire at each other with a rifle across the street, and then dodge behind a door, every day groups were to be seen gathered round these bullies, who were holding knives in their hands and daring each other to strike, but cherishing the secret hope that the spectators would interfere."

Again, he quotes another case, in which two men were stripped to the skin, well armed, armed, each with a brace of pistols and bowie knife, and then turned into a room perfectly dark, to fight out their quarrel. A horrid description follows of the combat. Before quoting the case, the reviewer remarks that even in America, this duel must have been regarded as something extraordinary. But, in the course of the description, he warms up with the subject, and at the close, exclaims: "Such horrid examples of unmitigated ferocity ought not to be quoted against the morality or social civilization of any country, unless, in the case of these States, they are not exceptional, but ordinary illustrations of the habits of the people!"

Now it is not worth while to attempt to set such a man to his right. He is deliberately, malignantly, with full purpose, bent on blackening the name of our country, and of all English writers. An Englishman is so insular in his prejudices, that he is the last of men to form a correct judgment of the character and institutions of other people. And an American is the last man an Englishman should write about. For a nation speaking a different language, distinguished by different customs from his own, he may make some allowances. He will at least see the absurdity of attempting to try it by any other than a universal standard. But, in the case of America he can make no such allowance. We speak the same language, are marked by the same general habits of thought and action, and in fundamental points, approach England in the character of our laws and political institutions. So that he forgets our peculiar circumstances, our recent origin, the unsettled condition of our population, and applies to us at once the English standard of life and manners.

Even enlightened Englishmen themselves will at times confess their unfitness to write of other nations. In the same number of the Quarterly in which appears this vituperative notice of our country, another reviewer takes William Howitt to task for his narrow criticism on German civilization. The following remarks are to the point:

"Of all book-writing people, the English are the last to produce works upon the domestic life of other nations, in the right, unbiased, universal spirit. It is not that they do not possess in a very high degree, the requisite qualifications, knowledge, keen observation, sagacity; but that they are afflicted with serious disqualifications which do not exist elsewhere, or, at least, to the same extent. Every thing that does not accord with their own modes and notions, a constant recurrence to the one rigid self-selected judgment. The English cannot enter into the circumstances of other races. Every thing that is new to them jars against their habits. Pleasure itself offends them when it is not cooked to their palate. Even the unalterable elements to which as much of the fabrications of human institutions is unavoidably adopted will sometimes excite a bilious derangement in the English. They will make little or no allowance for the inevitable effects of climate."

Why will not the gentlemen of the Quarterly, of "scrupulous and offended tastes," recall to mind these considerations when writing of America? Why must every thing, no matter how extravagant, which a wandering, strabismic tourist may choose to say of us and our institutions, be taken as sacred truth, while the reports of German life and manners, even by so benevolent and philosophical a man as William Howitt, are questioned severely, and received with great qualifications?

On the whole, we cannot but think, that Literary Men and Reviewers would do more service to the Cause of Humanity and Peace, if they loved truth better than fine writing—and if they would always bear in mind a saying of more than temporal interest—"The liar shall have his portion in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone."

The Supreme Court of the United States commenced its session in Washington, last Monday.

Neither House of Congress will sit to-day, both having adjourned over to Monday, to give time to the Members generally to settle down in their lodgings, and the President Officially to appoint the Standing Committee.

National Intelligence, 6th inst.

It is not too much to say that the Literary Men and Reviewers of Great Britain and France, are the principal causes of the bitter hatred and jealousy with which in many cases the Englishman and Frenchman regard each other. Could they have their way, they would keep both nations wallowing in blood. Literary men should be ministers of peace, but too often they are the ministers of war. A writer in the last Foreign Quarterly, reviewing French aggression in the Pacific, characterizes the French people, as "the most corrupt, cruel and rapacious nation in Europe." And again, speaking of M. Bunt, an agent of France in Tahiti, he says: "This is the gallant man, whom the French Government, urged on by a people, as blood thirsty now as in 1793, a people whose character never has changed since the massacre of St. Bartholomew, reckless of slaughter, incapable of comprehending the idea of justice, and which has chosen to identify itself all over the world with blasphemy and infidelity—this is the man," &c.

It is by such exaggerated denunciations, that nations are inflamed against each other, and negotiations for the peaceful settlement of difficulties, embarrassed.

But, to return to the reviewer of Featherston, who rivals even this latter of the French, in "the scrupulous and offended tastes of gentlemen." The refinement of his taste is only surpassed by the accuracy of his knowledge. He goes with Mr. Featherston to Arkansas, where "murder is cultivated as a pastime," and that describes Little Rock.

"Little Rock is the principal town of Arkansas, a territory lying on the confines between Texas and America, which not being yet sufficiently populated to be admitted to the dignity of a federal state, remains under the immediate protection of the General Government, as a quasi colony."

A man thus grossly ignorant of even the outside of our society, is well fitted to invite the readers of the far-famed Foreign Quarterly, in the mysteries of our inner life. A school boy in this country that should betray a similar degree of ignorance of the internal arrangements of Great Britain, would be laughed at.

But let us see with what "scrupulous and offended tastes" these gentlemen of the Quarterly write on what they know nothing about.

In consequence of this peculiar condition of independence, Arkansas has become a sort of Alsatia for all kinds of thieves and gamblers, forgers, horse-stealers, and the like, who, flying from the inconvenient inquiry of the laws of their hands and daring each other to strike, but cherishing the secret hope that the spectators would interfere."

Again, he quotes another case, in which two men were stripped to the skin, well armed, armed, each with a brace of pistols and bowie knife, and then turned into a room perfectly dark, to fight out their quarrel. A horrid description follows of the combat. Before quoting the case, the reviewer remarks that even in America, this duel must have been regarded as something extraordinary. But, in the course of the description, he warms up with the subject, and at the close, exclaims: "Such horrid examples of unmitigated ferocity ought not to be quoted against the morality or social civilization of any country, unless, in the case of these States, they are not exceptional, but ordinary illustrations of the habits of the people!"

Now it is not worth while to attempt to set such a man to his right. He is deliberately, malignantly, with full purpose, bent on blackening the name of our country, and of all English writers. An Englishman is so insular in his prejudices, that he is the last of men to form a correct judgment of the character and institutions of other people. And an American is the last man an Englishman should write about. For a nation speaking a different language, distinguished by different customs from his own, he may make some allowances. He will at least see the absurdity of attempting to try it by any other than a universal standard. But, in the case of America he can make no such allowance. We speak the same language, are marked by the same general habits of thought and action, and in fundamental points, approach England in the character of our laws and political institutions. So that he forgets our peculiar circumstances, our recent origin, the unsettled condition of our population, and applies to us at once the English standard of life and manners.

Even enlightened Englishmen themselves will at times confess their unfitness to write of other nations. In the same number of the Quarterly in which appears this vituperative notice of our country, another reviewer takes William Howitt to task for his narrow criticism on German civilization. The following remarks are to the point:

"Of all book-writing people, the English are the last to produce works upon the domestic life of other nations, in the right, unbiased, universal spirit. It is not that they do not possess in a very high degree, the requisite qualifications, knowledge, keen observation, sagacity; but that they are afflicted with serious disqualifications which do not exist elsewhere, or, at least, to the same extent. Every thing that does not accord with their own modes and notions, a constant recurrence to the one rigid self-selected judgment. The English cannot enter into the circumstances of other races. Every thing that is new to them jars against their habits. Pleasure itself offends them when it is not cooked to their palate. Even the unalterable elements to which as much of the fabrications of human institutions is unavoidably adopted will sometimes excite a bilious derangement in the English. They will make little or no allowance for the inevitable effects of climate."

</

